

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae

Giovanni Emmanuele

Gelfand-Phillips property in the completion of the space of
Pettis integrable functions

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 31 (1990), No. 3,
475--478

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/106882>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1990

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy
of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic
delivery and stamped with digital signature within the
project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library*
<http://project.dml.cz>

Gelfand—Phillips property in the completion of the space of Pettis integrable functions¹

G. EMMANUELE

Abstract. We consider the normed space $\mathcal{P}(\mu, X)$ of Pettis integrable functions with values in a Banach space X and we prove that if X has the Gelfand—Phillips property, then even the completion of $\mathcal{P}(\mu, X)$ has the same property.

Keywords: Pettis integrable functions, precompactness, Gelfand—Phillips property

Classification: 46E40, 46B20

Introduction.

Let (S, Σ, μ) be a finite measure space and X a Banach space. We consider the normed space $\mathcal{P}(\mu, X)$ of all (μ) -Pettis integrable functions, with values in X , equipped with the norm

$$\|f\| = \sup \left\{ \int_S |x^* f(s)| d\mu : x^* \in X^*, \|x^*\| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

We say that X has the Gelfand—Phillips property (see [1]) if any bounded subset M such that

$$(1) \quad \limsup_n \sup_M |x_n^*(x)| = 0 \text{ for any } w^*\text{-null sequence } (x_n^*) \subset X^*$$

is relatively compact. A set verifying (1) will be called "limited".

Purpose of this note is to prove that if X has the Gelfand—Phillips property, then the completion $\widehat{\mathcal{P}(\mu, E)}$ of $\mathcal{P}(\mu, E)$ has the same property.

In order to give our result we need the following remark done in [1].

Proposition 1. *If $f : S \rightarrow X$ is Pettis integrable and X has the Gelfand—Phillips property, then the set $\left\{ \int_A f(s) d\mu : A \in \Sigma \right\}$ is relatively compact.*

PROOF : Using the μ -continuity of the indefinite integral of f , together with the finiteness of μ , it is very easy to show that $\left\{ \int_A f(s) d\mu : A \in \Sigma \right\}$ is limited in X . ■

Result.

Our proof of the main result of the paper relies on the following theorem about the (strong) precompactness in the space $\mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$, the subspace of $\mathcal{P}(\mu, X)$ consisting of those f having an indefinite integral with compact range

¹Work performed under the auspices of G.N.A.F.A. of C.N.R. and partially supported by M.U.R.S.T. of Italy

Theorem 1. Let H be a bounded subset of $\mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$. If the following assumptions

- (i) the set $\{x^*f : x^* \in X^*, \|x^*\| \leq 1, f \in H\}$ is relatively compact in $L^1(\mu)$
- (ii) the set $\{\int_S g(s)f(s) d\mu : g \in L^\infty(\mu), \|g\| \leq 1, f \in H\}$ is relatively compact in X

are verified, then H is precompact in $\mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$.

PROOF : Choose $(f_n) \subset H$ and observe that under (i) and (ii), H is weakly precompact ([3]). Then we can assume, by passing to a subsequence if necessary, that f_n is weak Cauchy. Now, suppose that f_n has no Cauchy subsequences. There are $\eta > 0, (f_{n_h}), (f_{m_h})$ such that

$$\eta < \|f_{n_h} - f_{m_h}\| \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathbb{N}$$

For suitable sequences $(x_h^*) \subset X^*, \|x_h^*\| \leq 1, (g_h) \subset L^\infty(\mu), \|g_h\| \leq 1$, we have

$$\eta < \int_S g_h(s)(f_{n_h}(s) - f_{m_h}(s))x_h^* d\mu \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathbb{N}$$

Now, suppose that $(x_{h_\gamma}^*)$ and (g_{h_γ}) are suitable subnets weak* converging, respectively, to $x^* \in X^*, g \in L^\infty(\mu)$. Rewriting the last inequality for $(x_{h_\gamma}^*)$ and (g_{h_γ}) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta < \int_S x_{h_\gamma}^* g_{h_\gamma}(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu &= \int_S x_{h_\gamma}^* g_{h_\gamma}(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu - \\ &- \int_S x^* g_{h_\gamma}(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu + \int_S x^* g_{h_\gamma}(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu - \\ &- \int_S x^* g(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu + \int_S x^* g(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu = \\ &= (x_{h_\gamma}^* - x^*) \int_S g_{h_\gamma}(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu + \\ &+ \int_S x^*(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s))(g_{h_\gamma}(s) - g(s)) d\mu + \\ &+ \int_S x^* g(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that the following limit relations are verified

- (i) $\lim_\gamma (x_{h_\gamma}^* - x^*) \int_S g_{h_\gamma}(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu = 0$, because $x_{h_\gamma}^* - x^* \xrightarrow{w^*} \vartheta$ and (ii) holds true
- (ii) $\lim_\gamma \int_S x^*(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s))(g_{h_\gamma}(s) - g(s)) d\mu = 0$, because $g_{h_\gamma} - g \xrightarrow{w^*} \vartheta$ and (i) holds true
- (iii) $\lim_\gamma \int_S x^* g(s)(f_{n_{h_\gamma}}(s) - f_{m_{h_\gamma}}(s)) d\mu = 0$, because (f_n) is a weak Cauchy sequence.

The reached contradiction gives our thesis. ■

Remark 1. It is possible to show that even the converse of Theorem 1 is true.

Remark 2. In a sense, the above result is the best possible; indeed, if H is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mu, X)$ (it doesn't matter how the range of the indefinite integral is) for which the above Theorem is true, then H must be a subset of $\mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$. This follows very easily from (ii) by choosing $g = \chi_A, A \in \Sigma$.

Now, we are ready to give our main result

Theorem 2. *Assume that X has the Gelfand—Phillips property. Then $\mathcal{P}(\widehat{\mu}, X)$ has the same property.*

PROOF: First of all, note that $\mathcal{P}(\mu, X) = \mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$, by virtue of Proposition 1. And so we have just to prove that $\mathcal{P}_c(\widehat{\mu}, X)$ enjoys the Gelfand—Phillips property. Let H be a limited subset of $\mathcal{P}_c(\widehat{\mu}, X)$ and (z_n) be a sequence in H . By virtue of the density of $\mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$ we can choose a sequence $(f_n) \subset \mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$ that is limited and such that $\lim_n \|z_n - f_n\| = 0$. It will be enough to show that (f_n) is relatively compact. This will be done by proving that (f_n) verifies (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1; then the completeness of $\mathcal{P}_c(\widehat{\mu}, X)$ will do the remaining job. First of all, assume that the set $A = \{x^* f_n : x^* \in X^*, \|x^*\| \leq 1, n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ is not limited in $L^1(\mu)$. There are $(g_h) \subset L^\infty(\mu), \|g_h\| \leq 1, g_h \xrightarrow{w^*} \vartheta, (x_h^* f_{n_h}) \subset A$ for which $\inf_h |g_h x_h^* f_{n_h}| > 0$.

Now, observe that $g_h x_h^* \in [\mathcal{P}_c(\widehat{\mu}, X)]^*$ for any $h \in \mathbf{N}$ and furthermore $g_h x_h^* \xrightarrow{w^*} \vartheta$. This last assertion can be shown as it follows.

Take $f \in \mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$ and calculate $(g_h x_h^*)(f) = g_h(x_h^* f), h \in \mathbf{N}$. Since $f \in \mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$, a result due to Edgar ([2]) tells us that $(x_h^* f)$ is relatively compact in $L^1(\mu)$ and so

$$\lim_h g_h(x_h^* f) = 0$$

because $g_h \xrightarrow{w^*} \vartheta$. Since $\mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$ is dense in $\mathcal{P}_c(\widehat{\mu}, X)$ we can conclude that $g_h x_h^* \xrightarrow{w^*} \vartheta$, as we wanted. Being (f_n) limited in $\mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$ (and so in $\mathcal{P}_c(\widehat{\mu}, X)$) we get a contradiction. Hence $\{x^* f_n : x^* \in X^*, \|x^*\| \leq 1, n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ is limited in $L^1(\mu)$, a Banach space with the Gelfand—Phillips property. (i) of Theorem 1 is then true. Now we pass to (ii). Again, assume the set $\{\int_S g(s) f_n(s) d\mu : g \in L^\infty(\mu), \|g\| \leq 1, n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ is not limited in X . There are a weak* null sequence $(x_h^*) \subset X^*, \|x_h^*\| \leq 1$, and $(g_h f_{n_h})$ such that $\inf_h |x_h^*(g_h f_{n_h})| > 0$. But once more $(g_h x_h^*)$ is a weak* null sequence in $[\mathcal{P}_c(\widehat{\mu}, X)]^*$. Indeed, if $f \in \mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$ we have

$$\left| \int_S x_h^* g_h(s) f(s) d\mu \right| \leq \int_S |x_h^* g_h(s) f(s)| d\mu \leq \int_S |x_h^* f(s)| d\mu \text{ for all } h \in \mathbf{N}.$$

Now, observe that $x_h^* f \rightarrow 0$ almost uniformly. Putting $S_h^+ = \{s : x_h^* f(s) \geq 0\}$ and $S_h^- = \{s : x_h^* f(s) < 0\}, h \in \mathbf{N}$ we get, for any $h \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (2) \quad \int_S |x_h^* f(s)| d\mu &= \int_{S_h^+} x_h^* f(s) d\mu - \int_{S_h^-} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \leq \\ &\leq \left| \int_{S_h^+} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| + \left| \int_{S_h^-} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| \end{aligned}$$

Now, given $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $A_\varepsilon \in \Sigma$, $\mu(A_\varepsilon^c) < \varepsilon$, such that $x_h^* f \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on A_ε . On the other hand, the indefinite integral of f is μ -continuous and so given $\gamma > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that $\|\int_A f(s) d\mu\| < \gamma$ whenever $\mu(A) < \delta$. Take $\varepsilon = \delta$. By (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_S |x_h^* f(s)| d\mu &\leq \left| \int_{S_h^+ \cap A_\varepsilon} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| + \left| \int_{S_h^+ \setminus A_\varepsilon} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| + \\ &+ \left| \int_{S_h^- \cap A_\varepsilon} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| + \left| \int_{S_h^- \setminus A_\varepsilon} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| \leq \\ &\leq \left| \int_{S_h^+ \cap A_\varepsilon} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| + \left| \int_{S_h^- \cap A_\varepsilon} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| + \\ &+ \left\| \int_{S_h^+ \setminus A_\varepsilon} f(s) d\mu \right\| + \left\| \int_{S_h^- \cap A_\varepsilon} f(s) d\mu \right\| \leq \\ &\leq \left| \int_{S_h^+ \cap A_\varepsilon} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| + \left| \int_{S_h^- \cap A_\varepsilon} x_h^* f(s) d\mu \right| + 2\gamma \leq 2 \int_{A_\varepsilon} |x_h^* f(s)| d\mu + 2\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Since $x_h^* f \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on A_ε , we are done, i.e. we have reached the sought-for contradiction (use the density of $\mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{P}_c(\mu, X)}$, too). Being X a Banach space with the Gelfand—Phillips property, even (ii) in Theorem 1 is verified. The proof is complete. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] Diestel J., Uhl J.J., jr., *Progress in vector measures 1977-83*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1033, Springer Verlag, 1983.
- [2] Edgar G.A., *Measurability in Banach space, II*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **28** (1979), 559-579.
- [3] Emmanuele G., Musial K., *Weak precompactness in the space of Pettis integrable functions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., to appear.

Department of Mathematics, University of Catania, 95125 Catania, Italy

(Received February 19, 1990)